



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,459	03/11/2004	Kurt Brooks Uhler	N0184 US	7407
37583 7590 04/15/2008 NAVTEQ NORTH AMERICA, LLC 425 West RANDOLPH STREET SUITE 1200, PATENT DEPT CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
CAO, PHUONG THAO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2164				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/798,459

Applicant(s)

UHLIR ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong-Thao Cao

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CIS-100)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/07/2008

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 01/07/2008.
2. Claims 22 and 34 have been amended, claims 35-46 have been added, and claims 1-21 were previously cancelled. Currently, claims 22-46 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed by Applicant on 01/07/2008 has been received and considered. A copy of the reviewed IDS is enclosed with this office letter.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-25, 27, 28 and 30-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 26 and 29 are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that "Map Quests" teaches away from the method of Applicant's claim that recites that the "dataset" used in a "computer game" is extracted from the same "source geographic database" from which another "dataset" is extracted and used in a "navigation system", this argument is invalid since "Map Quests" is combined for its teaching

the feature of providing specific road model dataset (as recited in claim 26) and the feature of using geographical data for a computer game in different computing platforms (as recited in claim 29). In addition, since all applied references are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as applying real geographical data in development of computer systems (c.g., game program, simulation program), a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine them.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 22-24, 28, 30-32, 34, 35, 41, 42, 45 and 46 (effective filing date 03/11/2004) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulauskas et al. (US Patent No 6,401,033 issued on 6/4/2002) in view of Trovato (US Patent No 6,183,364 issued on 2/6/2001).

As to claim 22, Paulauskas et al. teaches:

“A method for deriving at least two products from a source geographic database, the source geographic database comprising data representing real-world geographic features” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 35-55] wherein each storage medium with an appropriate data for a geographic region is interpreted as a product from the geographic data 70 (source) including information about one or more geographic regions or coverage areas), the method comprising:

“extracting a first dataset from the source geographic database” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 42-50] wherein portion (e.g., some or all) of the geographic data can be broadly considered as a first dataset);

“writing the first dataset to a first computer-readable medium; (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 48-50]);

“using at least a portion of the first dataset in a real-world navigation system” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 4, lines 5-45]);

“extracting a second dataset from the source geographic database” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 42-50] wherein portion (e.g., some or all) of the geographic data can be broadly considered as a second dataset; also see [column 3, lines 53-55] wherein each storage medium with appropriate data for a geographic region represents a separate dataset);

“writing the second dataset to a second computer-readable medium” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 53-55] wherein each storage medium with appropriate data for a geographic region represents a separate dataset); and

“using at least a portion of the second dataset in a computer-game system; wherein the computer-game system is separate from the real-world navigation system” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 9, lines 56-62]).

However, Paulauskas et al. does not teach:

“wherein the second dataset is used in computer games that depict real geographic locales as part of play scenarios of the computer games”.

On the other hand, Trovato teaches:

“wherein the second dataset is used in computer games that depict real geographic locales as part of play scenarios of the computer games” (see Trovato, [column 2, lines 10-40] and [column 3, lines 25-30] wherein electronic map data provided to environment grower is interpreted as second dataset, and environments (e.g., simulated city) created based on real word data (i.e., electronic maps) and used in games is interpreted as real geographic locales as part of play scenarios as recited).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the teaching of Trovato into Paulauskas et al.'s system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Trovato in [column 2, lines 20-35] and [column 3, lines 4-6] that electronic maps digitized enough real world data to provide places for many digital users to play.

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“wherein the real-world navigation system is selected from a group consisting of: in-vehicle navigation systems, hand-held portable navigation system, personal computers, personal digital assistants, pagers, and telephones” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 2, lines 30-43]).

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“wherein using at least a portion of the first dataset in a real-world navigation system comprises providing a service selected from a set consisting of route calculation, route guidance, vehicle positioning, map display, and electronic yellow pages” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 1-15] and [column 4, lines 15-26]).

As to claim 28, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“combining at least a portion of the second dataset with a computer-game component selected from a set consisting of: characters, game logic, vehicles, game rules, rendering logic, and graphic logic” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 4, lines 58-62] for combining geographic data with game rules).

As to claim 30, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“accessing the second set of data using an application programming interface” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 6, lines 15-20] wherein the game application must obtain data from the geographic database through an application programming interface).

As to claim 31, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“accessing the second set of data using a spatial query” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 8, lines 27-30] and [column 9, lines 20-30] wherein query based on location is interpreted as spatial query).

As to claim 32, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 22 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“extracting data from the second set of data using spatial criteria” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 6, lines 15-25] wherein obtaining only sign text information along the route upon which the vehicle is traveling indicates the use of spatial criteria).

As to claim 34, Paulauskas et al. teaches:

“A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions stored thereon for performing a method for deriving at least two products from a source geographic database, the source geographic database comprising data representing real-world geographic features” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 35-55] wherein each storage medium with an appropriate data for a geographic region is interpreted as a product from the geographic data 70 (source) including information about one or more geographic regions or coverage areas), the method comprising:

“extracting a first dataset from the source geographic database” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 42-50] wherein portion (e.g., some or all) of the geographic data can be broadly considered as a first dataset);

“writing the first dataset to a first computer-readable medium; (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 48-50]);

“using at least a portion of the first dataset in a real-world navigation system” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 4, lines 5-45]);

“extracting a second dataset from the source geographic database” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 42-50] wherein portion (e.g., some or all) of the geographic data can be broadly considered as a second dataset; also see [column 3, lines 53-55] wherein each storage medium with appropriate data for a geographic region represents a separate dataset);

“writing the second dataset to a second computer-readable medium” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 53-55] wherein each storage medium with appropriate data for a geographic region represents a separate dataset); and

Art Unit: 2164

“using at least a portion of the second dataset in a computer-game system; wherein the computer-game system is separate from the real-world navigation system” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 9, lines 56-62]).

However, Paulauskas et al. does not teach:

“wherein the second dataset is used in computer games that depict real geographic locales as part of play scenarios of the computer games”.

On the other hand, Trovato teaches:

“wherein the second dataset is used in computer games that depict real geographic locales as part of play scenarios of the computer games” (see Trovato, [column 2, lines 10-40] and [column 3, lines 25-30] wherein electronic map data provided to environment grower is interpreted as second dataset, and environments (e.g., simulated city) created based on real word data (i.e., electronic maps) and used in games is interpreted as real geographic locales as part of play scenarios as recited).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the teaching of Trovato into Paulauskas et al.'s system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Trovato in [column 2, lines 20-35] and [column 3, lines 4-6] that electronic maps digitized enough real world data to provide places for many digital users to play.

As to claim 35, Paulauskas et al. teaches:

“A method of using a source database for forming derived products, wherein the source database contains data that represent geographic features in a region including roads in the

region” ((see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 35-55] wherein each storage medium with an appropriate data for a geographic region is interpreted as a product from the geographic data 70 (source) including information about one or more geographic regions or coverage areas), the method comprising:

“providing a first set of data from the source database to a first developer, wherein the first developer uses the first set of data in systems that provide navigation-related features, wherein the first set of data represents at least some of the geographic features in the region and further wherein the first set of data includes attributes suitable for use for providing navigation-related functions” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 3, lines 43-47] and [column 4, lines 10-45]);

“providing a second set of data from the source database to a second developer, wherein the second developer uses the second set of data in computer games” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 4, lines 58-62] for using geographic data (second set of data) in game application).

However, Paulauskas et al. does not teach:

“wherein the second dataset represents at least some of the geographic features in the region as part of play scenarios of the computer games”.

On the other hand, Trovato teaches:

“wherein the second dataset represents at least some of the geographic features in the region as part of play scenarios of the computer games” (see Trovato, [column 2, lines 10-40] and [column 3, lines 25-30] wherein electronic map data provided to environment grower is interpreted as second dataset, and environments (e.g., simulated city) created based on real word data (i.e., electronic maps) and used in games represents the geographic features in the region (i.e., a specific city) as part of play scenarios as recited).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the teaching of Trovato into Paulauskas et al.'s system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Trovato in [column 2, lines 20-35] and [column 3, lines 4-6] that electronic maps digitized enough real world data to provide places for many digital users to play.

As to claim 41, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“accessing the second set of data using an application programming interface” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 6, lines 15-20] wherein the game application must obtain data from the geographic database through an application programming interface).

As to claim 42, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“extracting data from the second set of data using spatial criteria to provide a second database product” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 6, lines 15-25] wherein obtaining only sign text information along the route upon which the vehicle is traveling indicates the use of spatial criteria).

As to claim 45, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“wherein the second set of data is combined with other game-related components to form computer games” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 4, lines 58-63] for combining geographical data (second set of data) with game data).

As to claim 46, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach:

“wherein the second set of data is combined with a computer-game components to form the computer games, wherein the other game-related components include at least one of a group consisting of: characters, game logic, vehicles, game rules, rendering logic, and graphic logic” (see Paulauskas et al., [column 4, lines 58-62] for combining geographic data with game rules; and see Trovato, [column 2, lines 35-65]).

9. Claims 25, 27, 33, 36, 38-40 and 43 (effective filing date 3/11/2004) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulauskas et al. (US Patent No 6,401,033 issued on 6/4/2002) in view of Trovato (US Patent No 6,183,364 issued on 2/6/2001), and further in view of Koller et al. (“Virtual GIS: A Real-Time 3D Geographic Information System”, IEEE: 1995).

As to claims 25 and 36, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach all limitations as recited in claims 22 and 35 respectively.

However, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato do not explicitly teach “combining at least a portion of the second dataset with a road-model dataset to provide a realistic visual appearance of roads; wherein the road-model dataset is separate from the source geographic database”.

On the other hand, Koller et al. teaches “combining at least a portion of the second dataset with a road-model dataset to provide a realistic visual appearance of roads; wherein the road-model dataset is separate from the source geographic database” (see Koller et al., [page 96, column 1, paragraph 2] and [page 96, column 2, paragraph 4] for combining geographic information database (second dataset) and models of roads, trees, buildings, vehicles (road-model dataset)).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Koller et al. into Paulauskas et al.’s system (as modified by Trovato). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to do so to effectively provide realistic visual appearance of roads in the region, thereby improving the graphical representation of system. In addition, a suggestion of combination with Koller et al. is indicated in Trovato, [column 2, lines 20-35].

As to claims 27 and 38-40, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach all limitations as recited in claims 22 and 35 respectively.

However, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato do not teach “combining at least a portion of the second dataset with a 3D-model dataset to provide a realistic visual presentation of a feature

Art Unit: 2164

selected from a set consisting of: polygon-shape features, cityscape features, landscape features, buildings, fences, trees, shrubbery, lawns, and clouds; wherein the 3D-model dataset is separate from the source geographic database”.

On the other hand, Koller et al. teaches “combining at least a portion of the second dataset with a 3D-model dataset to provide a realistic visual presentation of a feature selected from a set consisting of: polygon-shape features, cityscape features, landscape features, buildings, fences, trees, shrubbery, lawns, and clouds; wherein the 3D-model dataset is separate from the source geographic database” (see Koller et al., [page 95, column 2, paragraph 2-4], [page 96, column 1, paragraph 2 and 3] and [page 96, column 2, paragraph 4] for combining geographic information database (second data set) with 3D models of shapes, trees, buildings, roads, waterways (3D-model dataset).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Koller et al. into Paulauskas et al.'s system (as modified by Trovato). A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a realistic visual representation of features in the region thereby providing an effective way to build computer game scenes with more realistic views which plays a key role in attracting computer game users. In addition, a suggestion of combination with Koller et al. is indicated in Trovato, [column 2, lines 20-35].

As to claims 33 and 43, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach all limitations as recited in claims 22 and 35 respectfully.

However, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato do not teach “filtering data from the second set of data to provide a desired level of accuracy”.

On the other hand, Koller et al. teaches “filtering data from the second set of data to provide a desired level of accuracy” (see Koller et al., [page 97, column 1, paragraph 3-5]).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the teaching of Koller et al. into Paulauskas et al.’s system (as modified by Trovato). A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide the computer game developers with a flexible and effective way to get only a set of data needed to render pictures with desired level of accuracy in their computer games. In addition, a suggestion of combination with Koller et al. is indicated in Trovato, [column 2, lines 20-35].

10. Claims 26 and 37 (effective filing date 3/11/2004) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulauskas et al. (US Patent No 6,401,033 issued on 6/4/2002), in view of Trovato (US Patent No 6,183,364 issued on 2/6/2001) and Koller et al. (“Virtual GIS: A Real-Time 3D Geographic Information System”, IEEE: 1995), and further in view of Freedman (Map Quests, 2/2004).

As to claim 26, Paulauskas et al., Trovato and Koller et al. teach all limitations of claim 25.

However, Paulauskas et al., Trovato and Koller et al. do not explicitly teach “wherein the road-model dataset comprises a feature selected from a set consisting of:

Art Unit: 2164

road-pavement colors, lane-stripe markings, curbs, sidewalks, signs, lampposts, land dividers, traffic signals, speed bumps, and crosswalks”.

On the other hand, Freedman teaches “wherein the road-model dataset comprises a feature selected from a set consisting of: road-pavement colors, lane-stripe markings, curbs, sidewalks, signs, lampposts, land dividers, traffic signals, speed bumps, and crosswalks” (see Freedman, see the picture of game “True Crime: Streets of LA”).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the teaching of Freedman into Paulauskas et al.’s system (as modified by Trovato and Koller et al.). A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to in order to provide a realistic visual representation of roads with its related features thereby providing an effective way to build computer game scenes with more realistic views which plays a key role in attracting computer game users.

As to claim 37, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach all limitations as recited in claim 35.

However, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato do not explicitly teach “combining at least a portion of the second dataset with a road-model dataset to provide a realistic visual appearance of roads in the region”.

On the other hand, Koller et al. teaches “combining at least a portion of the second dataset with a road-model dataset to provide a realistic visual appearance of roads in the region” (see Koller et al., [page 96, column 1, paragraph 2] and [page 96, column 2, paragraph 4] for combining geographic information database (second dataset) and models of roads, trees, buildings, vehicles (road-model dataset)).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Koller et al. into Paulauskas et al.'s system (as modified by Trovato). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to do so to effectively provide realistic visual appearance of roads in the region, thereby improving the graphical representation of system. In addition, a suggestion of combination with Koller et al. is indicated in Trovato, [column 2, lines 20-35].

However, Paulauskas et al., Trovato and Koller et al. do not explicitly teach

“wherein the road-model dataset comprises a feature selected from a set consisting of: road-pavement colors, lane-stripe markings, curbs, sidewalks, signs, lampposts, land dividers, traffic signals, speed bumps, and crosswalks”.

On the other hand, Freedman teaches “wherein the road-model dataset comprises a feature selected from a set consisting of: road-pavement colors, lane-stripe markings, curbs, sidewalks, signs, lampposts, land dividers, traffic signals, speed bumps, and crosswalks” (see Freedman, see the picture of game “True Crime: Streets of LA”).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the teaching of Freedman into Paulauskas et al.'s system (as modified by Trovato and Koller et al.). A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to in order to provide a realistic visual representation of roads with its related features thereby providing an effective way to build computer game scenes with more realistic views which plays a key role in attracting computer game users.

11. Claims 29 and 44 (effective filing date 3/11/2004) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulauskas et al. (US Patent No 6,401,033 issued on 6/4/2002) in view of Trovato (US Patent No 6,183,364 issued on 2/6/2001), and further in view of Freedman (Map Quests, 2/2004).

As to claims 29 and 44, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato teach all limitations of claims 22 and 35 respectively.

However, Paulauskas et al. and Trovato do not explicitly teach:

“providing at least a portion of the second dataset to each of a plurality of end-user computing platforms”; and

“on each of the plurality of end-user computing platforms, using at least a portion of second dataset to represent geographic features in a play scenario of a computer game”.

On the other hand, Freedman teaches:

“providing at least a portion of the second dataset to each of a plurality of end-user computing platforms” (see Freedman, under “True Crime: Streets of LA”, wherein satellite imagery, GPS and geological surveys provides geographic data to the game which operates on multiple computing platforms (e.g., PS2, GameCube, Xbox)); and

“on each of the plurality of end-user computing platforms, using at least a portion of second dataset to represent geographic features in a play scenario of a computer game” (see Freedman, under “True Crime: Streets of LA”, presenting streets of LA as game scenes).

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the teaching of Freedman into Paulauskas et al.'s system (as

modified by Trovato). A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to in order to provide a realistic scenes in virtual game environment, thereby providing computer games with realistic real-life views which plays a key role in attracting computer game users.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Chiu et al. (US Publication No 2005/0159216) discloses a simulation game system/method integrating real-life geographical information to provide realistic game backgrounds.

Stephens (US Publication No 2004/0236543) discloses a city model generation process in which a city model is generated using information about an actual city (e.g., city roadway database), and a city model can be incorporated into software application (e.g., game application).

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Phuong-Thao Cao** whose telephone number is (571)272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phuong-Thao Cao
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2164
April 3, 2008

/Charles Rones/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164